DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 502 HE 035 539

AUTHOR	Applegate, James L.
TITLE	Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing with New Eyes. PFF Occasional Paper Series.
INSTITUTION	Association of American Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC.; Council of Graduate Schools, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Pew Charitable Trusts, Philadelphia, PA.
REPORT NO	PPF-OP-9
ISBN	ISBN-0-911696-89-X
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	20p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Graduate Students; *Graduate Study; Intellectual Disciplines; *Partnerships in Education; *Professional Associations; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a vision of what disciplinary societies can and should do to support the Preparing Future Faculty Program (PFF) and similar educational reform agendas at both graduate and undergraduate levels. The main thesis is that college and university initiatives to improve the quality of education should be reinforced by comparable initiatives in the disciplinary societies. Improvements in the quality of education are most likely to come about, the essay asserts, by changing both campus and disciplinary cultures. The PFF program was launched in 1993 to develop new models of doctoral preparation for a faculty career by including preparation for teaching and academic citizenship as well as for research Through national competitions, grants have been awarded to 43 doctoral producing universities to develop and implement model programs to bring expectations for undergraduate professors into the graduate preparation of future academics. Since 1998, PFF has developed partnerships with 11 professional societies in academic disciplines. The change advocated in this document asks for the development of a substantive vision for each of the disciplines to show how each can best engage the needs of students and society. The disciplines need to develop a passion about the vision, and then they must commit to action, with public engagement and accountability. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Association of American Colleges & Universities

ED 471 502

Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing with New Eyes

BY JAMES L. APPLEGATE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.G. James

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Preparing Future Faculty

A A C & U

Council of Graduate Schools

ED 435539

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Preparing Future Faculty program is sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and the Council of Graduate Schools. The program is made possible with funding from the participating institutions and by grants from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the National Science Foundation, and The Atlantic Philanthropies.

This publication is made possible with funding from The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Copyright © 2002
Association of American Colleges & Universities
1818 R Street, NW
Washington, DC 20009
202/387-3760

ISBN No. 0-911696-89-X

Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing with New Eyes

by James L. Applegate

Association of American Colleges and Universities

Council of Graduate Schools

PFF Occasional Paper Series

Anderson, H. J., G. Gaff, and A.S. Pruitt-Logan. n.d. *Frequently asked questions about Preparing Future Faculty.* Number 1. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

DeNeef, A. L. 1996. *Lessons of PFF concerning the job market.* Number 2. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pruitt, A.S.. n.d. *The Preparing Future Faculty program and teaching assistant training: Building bridges.* Number 3. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Tice, S. L. 1997. *The relationships between faculty preparation programs and teaching assistant development programs.* Number 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Bogle, E., J. A. Blondin, J. L. Miller, and the PFF Staff. 1997. *Memo to graduate students: Preparing to be the faculty of the future.* Number 5. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Pruitt-Logan, A. S., J. G. Gaff, and R. A. Weibl. 1998. *The impact: Assessing the experiences of PFF program participants, 1994-1996.* Number 6. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Adams, K. 2002. *What colleges and universities want in new faculty.* Number 7. Washington, D.C.:Association of American Colleges and Universities.

DeNeef, A.L. 2002. *The Preparing Future Faculty Program: What difference does it make?* Number 8. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Applegate, J. L. 2002. *Engaged graduate education: Seeing with new eyes.* Number 9. Washington, D.C.: Association of American College and Universities.

About This Publication

In this provocative paper, James Applegate presents a vision of what disciplinary societies can and should do to support the Preparing Future Faculty Program and similar educational reform agendas at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. The main thesis is that college and university initiatives to improve the quality of education should be reinforced by comparable initiatives in the disciplinary societies. Improvements in the quality of education are most likely to come about, the essay argues, by changing "*both* campus and disciplinary cultures."

The Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program was launched in 1993 to develop new models of doctoral preparation for a faculty career by including preparation for teaching and academic citizenship as well as for research. Through a series of national competitions, grants have been awarded to forty-three doctoral-producing universities and their departments to develop and implement such model programs that bring expectations for undergraduate professors into the graduate preparation of future academics. One stipulation of grants has been that the universities cannot do this work by themselves. They were required to form a cluster of diverse institutions—now numbering 252—so that the graduate students could have direct, personal experience with faculty life, as it is lived in institutions with different missions, student bodies, and expectations for faculty.

Starting in 1998, PFF developed partnerships with eleven professional societies in the academic disciplines of biology, chemistry, communication, computer science, English, history, mathematics, physics, political science, psychology, and sociology. Leaders of learned societies in these fields were eager to encourage broader preparation for their faculty members, and each conducted national competitions to award grants to departments to develop model PFF programs. Each of the societies has been highlighting PFF ideas and the work of the new PFF programs in their national and regional meetings, in their print and electronic communications, and their special action initiatives.

James Applegate has the perfect set of credentials to call for improvements in the quality of education. He is vice president for academic affairs for the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education, having been professor of communication and chair of the department at the University of Kentucky. When he formulated this essay he was the president of the National Communication Association (NCA), where he was able to

provide leadership for the work of his professional society. He has been working on both institutional and disciplinary initiatives of PFF and other educational reform agendas. Most of this essay was contained in the keynote speech he delivered on June 22, 2001 at the PFF Summer Conference in Boston.

Jerry G. Gaff
Co-Director, Preparing Future Faculty
Association of American Colleges
and Universities

Anne S. Pruitt-Logan
Co-Director, Preparing Future Faculty
Council of Graduate Schools

Engaged Graduate Education: Seeing with New Eyes

If changing higher education is like trying to move a battleship with your bare hands, I am not sure what metaphor captures the difficulty in changing graduate education. Still, it is being done campus-by-campus, program-by-program through initiatives like the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program. My goal here is to place PFF programs in the context of a larger national reform agenda that promises to change the nature of the relationship between society and higher education, particularly graduate education. I write from two perspectives. One is as immediate past president of the National Communication Association (NCA), the largest association of communication scholars. I am proud that our discipline is one of the leaders in developing PFF programs in the disciplines, and I applaud the leadership of PFF for engaging the disciplinary societies in this effort.

Academic disciplinary societies have been slow to rise to the challenge of higher education reform. While many well-intentioned provosts, deans, and faculty members talk of campus reform, they are often not supported by similar reform efforts from the disciplines. Disciplinary societies signal what is important and define quality in their fields by the content of their journals, the programs at their conferences, and the special activities they sponsor. If it is important for the academy to do a better job of preparing future faculty, creating socially engaged campuses, or embedding the scholarship of teaching and learning into campus classrooms, these agendas need to be embraced by disciplinary societies. If faculty members scan their journals, conference programs, and other intellectual activities of their disciplines and see none of these innovations, they will be reluctant to embrace these initiatives, no matter how much campus administrators may exhort them. They will continue with safer traditional practices that are recognized by their disciplines. Only through changing both campus and disciplinary cultures will we succeed in our efforts to change graduate education and higher education as a whole.

In addition to my role as former president of NCA, I am also vice president for academic affairs for the State of Kentucky. Thus, the perspective I bring is formed by an understanding of how states across the nation, the primary funders of higher education, are altering their expectations for higher education in ways that support Preparing Future Faculty program goals, but the states also require broadening that work. In Kentucky, for example, we have created an endowment of over $400 million focused on our two doctoral-granting institutions. The primary goal of this substantial investment is not to raise the disciplinary status of those doctoral programs, although that may be an important side effect. The goal is to increase the number of students enrolled in higher education by 50 percent. This increase will require future faculty to

be prepared to teach a more diverse set of students from varied ethnic backgrounds, adult students, and many more students who are first-time college-goers in their families. We expect our graduate programs to do a better job of preparing future faculty to ensure the learning and success of that increasingly diverse group of students.

We also look to our doctoral programs and our faculty in those programs to help provide an infrastructure for a "new economy" initiative in Kentucky. Faculty must be prepared to engage their expertise with the public and private sectors to develop intellectual properties and patents, and generally to provide the research infrastructure necessary to drive a new economy in the state.

In short, Kentucky, like so many states, is asking doctoral programs to focus less on improving disciplinary status and more on equipping faculty to improve the lives of citizens. States across the country are demanding that this nation's multibillion dollar investment in higher education provide significant short- and long-term benefits to every level of society.

Higher education is contributing to the common good. Alan Greenspan has credited a great deal of the current success of the U.S. economy in a global society and American leadership generally to the contributions of higher education, especially since World War II. However, our contributions are a trickle compared to a broad river of good that we can do if we reenvision our role and commit to being engaged public intellectuals.

Seeing with New Eyes

Marcel Proust, the philosopher/novelist, said that the real act of discovery lies not in finding new lands but in seeing with new eyes. If we are to maximize our contributions to society, we must begin to see our basic work of teaching and research with new eyes.

Another great philosopher, hockey's Wayne Gretzky, said that the secret to success was not in skating to where the puck *is* but to where the puck *will be*. We must create doctoral programs that prepare faculty not to accommodate higher education as it is, but to be agents of change, helping higher education play its proper role in a twenty-first century global society. We must help our future colleagues skate to where the puck will be.

Preparing Future Faculty's challenge is to help our current and future colleagues understand and commit to the connection of work in all disciplines to the creation of a healthy, civil, humane, and participatory society. Faculty members have a role in the creation and sustenance of a "public," as John Dewey defined that term: a public fraught with differences but committed to common goals and the promise of communication as a means of creating the common ground to accomplish those goals; communication across disciplines, communication among institutions at all levels, and communication between the academic community and society at large.

From biology and chemistry to psychology and communication to English and the arts, current faculty members and our next generation of colleagues must reject the vision of "the well frog." The well frog lives its life at the bottom of its disciplinary well. It believes the sky is limited to what it can see from the bottom of its well. We must break out of our disciplinary wells and discover the connection of our work to the creation of a society that is healthier physically, economically, and socially. We need to encourage an outward vision, seeing our work as a means to an end: a healthier society and better lives for the people that live within it.

All of this sounds very grand, but how does it translate into action? One good translation is the work that PFF programs are doing. This work addresses what Chris Golde and Timothy Dore (2001), in their survey of doctoral students, called a three-way mismatch between the traditional purposes of doctoral education, doctoral student aspirations, and reality. As faculty, we know this mismatch and are working to correct it. We know we continue to prepare students for employment in research universities when, in fact, most of the jobs are elsewhere in academia and in the private and public sectors outside of academia. Students often come to us because they want to teach, but we do very little to help them become scholars of teaching and learning. Students do not fully understand the demands that will be made upon them to earn the Ph.D. Looking at us as models, they hold very traditional aspirations for becoming faculty, showing little awareness of external opportunities for careers and the opportunity, even as academics, to connect their expertise to the needs of society.

We need to encourage an outward vision, seeing our work as a means to an end: a healthier society and better lives for the people that live within it.

Among other negative effects, this mismatch contributes to our inability to attract underrepresented student groups into doctoral education. The kinds of activities that attract students of color and other underrepresented groups to doctoral education include the opportunity to be scholars of teaching, to increase learning and access to higher education, find non-academic careers, and to link their work as public intellectuals to service to the common good.

Faculty members are addressing this mismatch in a variety of ways. A visit to the University of Washington's Re-Envisioning the Ph.D. Web site (www.grad.washington.edu/envision/), the Woodrow Wilson Foundation's Responsive Ph.D. site (www.woodrow.org/responsivephd), and, of course, the PFF site (www.preparing-faculty.org) provides a sense of the range of innovations aimed at better aligning graduate education with the needs of students, industry, academia, and society as a whole.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

But for all of this effort, I suggest that too much of our vision is focused on where the puck is. We have an opportunity to shift the focus to preparing faculty to move to where the puck will be. This is a transition period for the Preparing Future Faculty program. We have the challenge of finding new types of funding and embedding this initiative in university infrastructures so that PFF is no longer an add-on program. As we change, I challenge us to lead a broader graduate reform effort.

We have new allies in this work. Most of us are already familiar with the Re-Envisioning the Ph.D. project at the University of Washington organized by Jody Nyquist. The Woodrow Wilson Foundation is building on that effort with its Responsive Ph.D. initiative and recently announced its first set of partner institutions. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is developing a new doctoral education reform program. To ensure collaboration and coordination, meetings are planned among the leaders of all of these efforts. However, the real effectiveness of this broad reform depends on the success of our activities as faculty mentors to prepare future colleagues for a new engaged role, to help them see their faculty role with new eyes.

Vision, Passion, Action

The change I advocate has three parts. First, we must develop a substantive *vision* for how each of the disciplines can best engage the needs of students and society. This will require fundamental rethinking of our teaching and research activities. I will address this issue in more detail later.

Second, we need to develop a *passion* about the vision we will pursue. I know that passion is a term that sits uncomfortably with academics. Typically, we think of ourselves as dispassionate critics, walled within the ideology of objectivism. We see our role as generating knowledge and transmitting that knowledge in the classroom. However, a vision without passion is the worst form of bureaucratic spirit. At best, it is what we often call a strategic plan. At worst, it is simply a set of strategies to help us achieve personal or group success. On the other hand, passion without thoughtful vision invites demagoguery. We certainly see enough of that in politics and even inside of academia. As academics, we are in a unique position to blend vision and passion to better realize what the German philosopher Habermas called the "ideal communicative context" in which, "the gentle force of the better idea will prevail." We can ensure that better ideas will prevail in public discourse because of their "betterness," that is, their superior quality, not because

We must help future colleagues develop their own vision for how to assume the stage as engaged public intellectuals with their research and teaching.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

they are advocated by those who are most powerful, tenured, or supported by the largest sums of money. As scholars and critics we can bring to the table a unique form of "passionate rationality" that encourages reflective action driven by the gentle force of the better idea.

In addition to vision and passion, we must commit to *action* and to the courage to fail publicly. The research and teaching that we should do requires public engagement and public accountability. The traditional academic environment is structured to keep most of our failures relatively private. If we fail in the classroom, only we, our students, and perhaps our department chair are aware of that failure. If we fail to publish our research, notice of the failure typically comes in a private letter from an editor based on an anonymous review.

If we are to develop an engaged agenda for our work, we must have the courage to fail publicly. If we accept millions of dollars in grant funds, for example, to do the necessary research to create an effective public health campaign designed to reduce the number of young people using drugs, and our first efforts fail, the world will know. If, for example, we engage our expertise as public intellectuals to help our communities manage sustainable growth or better accommodate an increasingly diverse population and these programs fail, the community will know. We will fail, we will learn, and we will eventually succeed, but we must have the courage to take this risk. If we do work that matters, not doing it successfully also will matter.

We must help future colleagues develop their own vision for how to assume the stage as engaged public intellectuals with their research and teaching. We must encourage them to develop a passion about their work that will sustain a lifelong commitment, and we must help them develop the courage to act and to fail publicly if that is what it takes to serve the public. This is a very new agenda for preparing future faculty programs.

Creating a New Vision of Research and Teaching

What is involved in seeing our basic work, research and teaching, with new eyes?

A 1999 volume of the late Donald Stokes, entitled *Pasteur's Quadrant* points us in the right direction in rethinking our research. Stokes convincingly argues that the simplistic linear continuum between basic and applied research that has dominated much of higher education's thinking since World War II is not only an inaccurate historical description of research, but also totally inadequate as a policy framework to guide twenty-first century research. Stokes offers a more complex model for thinking about the types of research that faculty can and should do. Research, he argues, falls into four quadrants, three of which I will discuss here. The research in each quadrant influences research in all the others. Stokes's first quadrant captures what we traditionally think of as basic research. He calls this Bohr's quadrant because it has much in common with the early work of Niels

Bohr on atomic structure. He calls a second quadrant Edison's quadrant. This is traditional applied research. Like Edison, researchers in this area are more interested in making something work or in solving a practical problem and less concerned with connecting research to a larger theoretical heuristic.

The third, and most significant, quadrant is Pasteur's quadrant. Louis Pasteur is often thought of as the father of microbiology. Few people have done more to alter our basic understanding of life processes. Yet, if you examine the research of Pasteur, it is what Stokes calls "use-inspired basic research." Pasteur's work was devoted to solving problems—to finding solutions that improved the lives of the people around him.

Stokes's book is rich with examples of research across many disciplines that share the characteristics of Louis Pasteur's research. It is this use-inspired basic research that we must do a better job of explaining and encouraging as we prepare future faculty.

Stokes's analysis makes clear that research has always reflected a complex interweaving of basic, applied, and use-inspired basic research. Each approach informs the problems and methods driving the others. One does not necessarily precede or supersede the other. It is this model of research that we must communicate to our new colleagues as we prepare them to become future faculty.

Policy concerns about research in the twenty-first century will only increase the demand for research within Pasteur's quadrant. Evidence for this shift is abundant. The MacArthur Foundation recently funded a series of projects aimed at integrating research and practice. Even the National Science Foundation, created after World War II as the brainchild of Vannevar Bush, father of the linear basic-applied research continuum, has begun to fund more interdisciplinary problem-focused research. One example is its recent initiative, Science and Technology in the Public Interest.

It is sometimes said that society has problems, while universities have departments. We have to overcome both departmental and disciplinary divisions to address the challenges that society faces in ways that generate basic knowledge and solve problems. I encourage us to prepare our doctoral students to reconceptualize how they will construct their research careers and to consider seriously the role of use-inspired basic research.

Faculty also must see our *teaching* role with new eyes. To take the scholarship of teaching and learning seriously is to understand that teaching is a means to an end, and that end is to engage students on and off-campus in active learning. It is not enough to simply be a good teacher. Scholars of teaching are committed to experimenting with new practices, assessing those practices, engaging in peer review, and sharing those practices with the teaching community so that their own teaching improves as does the practice of teaching generally.

Today's conversation about teaching is rich with discussions of new strategies to enhance learning. Learning communities, interdisciplinary perspectives, and

problem-based and service learning are all at the center of a new scholarly agenda for graduate and undergraduate teaching. These discussions enhance learning and teach students that there is nothing wrong with pursuing an education to obtain the good life, as long as they understand that the privilege of this education commits them to a life of doing good. Our teaching role must extend beyond the boundaries of the classroom and the campus. We must be lifelong learners as well as teachers in this endeavor.

An example of an undergraduate teaching and research project captures many of these ideas. Recently, the National Communication Association partnered with the Southern Poverty Law Center, a leading civil rights organization, and others in a Communicating Common Ground project. Participants create partnerships across the country in which communication faculty and students join with communities and schools to embrace the opportunities of diversity while rejecting the hate and mistrust that can accompany confrontation with human difference. The project currently involves more than forty partners, including research universities, community colleges, and liberal arts colleges. Students, faculty, and community partners are teaching one another how to address this challenge through more effective communication and community building. Teaching and research are integrated into partnership work. For example, some partnerships include efforts to gain basic knowledge about how we increase the cognitive and communicative capacities of children to deal with human difference while improving the quality of life in their communities.

Each discipline can develop a new model for teaching scholarship appropriate to the values and focus of the discipline.

In one partnership, faculty and students are working together in a school with a history of ethnic violence. For the last five years, on the anniversary of an unfortunate encounter between Armenian and Hispanic students, ugly and sometimes violent exchanges between these two groups of students have occurred. Our partners have been working with this school developing projects designed to help students understand their differences and communicate more effectively. This year for the first time no confrontation occurred on the anniversary of the event. Students and faculty are talking with one another and overcoming mistrust.

A recent volume (Huber and Morreale 2002) on disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning makes clear how each discipline can develop a new model for teaching scholarship appropriate to the values and focus of the discipline. New faculty must have the opportunity to participate in that conversation and become scholars of teaching and learning.

Creating a Disciplinary Vision

As senior scholars embracing a new twenty-first century vision of research and teaching scholarship, we must articulate areas where our disciplines, given their specific expertise, can best engage society's problems. We must articulate an engaged public vision of our work. As president of the National Communication Association, I had the privilege of helping develop such an engaged vision for the communication discipline. As we considered communication's unique opportunities to address pressing problems facing society, we began to articulate a national agenda for our engaged research. The agenda is organized around three "divides" that threaten the health of our society: the racial divide, the civic divide, and the digital divide.

W.E. Dubois said, at the start of the twentieth century that race was the great question facing America. As we begin the twenty-first century, his comment is no less true for America and the world. Race and ethnicity are a challenge and an opportunity as the shrinking globe and legacies of ethnic hatred threaten our vision of a civil and open society. Surely since September 11, 2001, when blind group-hate tore at the fabric of humanity, we understand even more clearly our responsibility to help society find ways to prevent such horrific acts and formulate long-term solutions that do not destroy our humanity in the interest of preserving it.

Future faculty must see with new eyes the more complex array of possibilities for their research and embrace a commitment to the common good and to their status as public intellectuals.

In our role as public intellectuals, we have an important contribution to make in understanding the dynamics of intercultural and international communication and in improving the practice of communication in the interest of a successful and diverse society. The Communicating Common Ground project mentioned earlier is one example of a number of projects the communication discipline has initiated that begin to integrate research and practice around the issue of the racial divide.

We also believe that the communication discipline has an important contribution to make in helping this country bridge the civic divide that Robert Putnam documented in his book, *Bowling Alone* (2001). While scholars like Todd Gitlin and others have ably critiqued Putnam's work, I remain convinced our democracy has a problem: that this country's social capital is in worse shape than its economic capital. Given the resurgence of patriotic rhetoric since September 11, I wonder

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

if this will produce a sustained commitment to civic engagement after the initial shock wears off. How will we promote civic engagement that extends across time and national boundaries? To put it simply, attaching flags to our cars and windows is a long way from committing to being informed participants in political discourse within a global society.

Putnam keynoted an NCA conference on political communication and documented the long-term generational decline in engagement of Americans in all forms of civic life. Reversing the trend will require sustained effort on multiple fronts. One part of the solution is improving the quality of political communication and the structure of politics to help citizens reengage in public discourse. Working with individuals to improve their communication skills so that they can constructively engage in conflict is another part of that solution. We are focusing scholarly energy on understanding the dynamics of the civic divide and developing communication solutions to bridge that divide.

The last part of our engaged vision for the communication discipline addresses what has come to be known as the digital divide. Some policy makers in Washington are suggesting that the digital divide is no longer a serious issue for America. However, scholarship across disciplines indicates that the digital divide is still very much with us and is taking new forms. The May 2001 issue of *Education Week* focuses on the digital divides that plague our educational system. We should be very concerned about our inability as a society to provide equal opportunity to all students, rich and poor, to gain the knowledge needed to use these amazing new technologies to improve their lives.

Today, the digital divide is primarily about systematic differences in what people know—or do not know—about using new technologies. This makes our role as scholars, in both the research and teaching arenas, all the more crucial in addressing the problems this divide creates. The NCA has created a digital divide task force that is multidisciplinary and involves the private and non-profit sectors in efforts to reduce the digital divide.

These initiatives begin our efforts to create an engaged communication discipline. I hope that every discipline and every university faculty member will articulate a vision for an engaged model of teaching and research that makes best use of their particular expertise to serve as public intellectuals contributing to the common good.

Reenvisioning the Academic Community

Let me suggest a benefit of this reenvisioning process for the academic community itself. In the July/August 1994 edition of *Change*, William F. Massey and his colleagues wrote about the "hollowed collegiality" that characterizes the American academic setting. For those of us who live in that setting, the analysis still rings all too true. Faculty members feel isolated. Their work is fragmented and disconnected. There are divisions between junior and senior faculty. Our roles and rewards

structure is inappropriate to encourage and support the engaged vision of scholarship articulated here. Our teaching mission is undervalued and our research remains trapped within narrow disciplinary boundaries. Massey's survey of faculty suggests that, while we are capable of maintaining a veneer of civility and politeness, we are often unable or unwilling to engage the difficult substantive issues that allow us to better meet the needs of our students and society.

Someone once said that the reason academic battles are often so vicious is because the stakes are so small. And, when the outcome is all about us, our departments, and small changes in the allocation of limited resources within the academ ic community, these stakes *are* small. But I can tell you that in programs where I have seen faculty and graduate students truly embracing an engaged model of teaching and research, where they begin to see how their work matters in important ways to the lives of students and the society around them, "hollowed collegiality" no longer remains an option. They address the difficult issues surrounding the creation of interdisciplinary research teams. They work together to become scholars of teaching and learning because they understand how important the stakes are for students. As they begin to see the impact of their work, their energy, their excitement, and their commitment to the work skyrocket. Yes, there is still conflict, but that conflict is always discussed within the larger context of the outcomes of the work and not in the narrow context of departmental, university, and disciplinary politics. By embracing and helping our doctoral students embrace a vision of engaged teaching and research, we will provide benefits to the people who need us and improve the internal dynamics of the academic community.

Conclusion

Much has been done in the last decade through the Preparing Future Faculty program, and that work will continue. I have tried to articulate a sense of what our new work must be about. It is about seeing with new eyes and helping our future colleagues to see with new eyes. It is about preparing future faculty to skate to where the puck will be in higher education. It is about our students being scholars of teaching and learning who can effectively serve a more diverse cohort of students inside and outside the academy. Future faculty must see with new eyes the more complex array of possibilities for their research and embrace a commitment to the common good and to their status as public intellectuals. They must develop an engaged vision of scholarship, pursue it with passion, commit to action, and have the courage to fail publicly, if that is what it takes to learn how to eventually serve the public successfully.

Let us see ourselves with new eyes and imagine the meaningful outcomes of our work. Imagine communities free of hate, where people have the cognitive and communicative capacities to embrace the rich opportunities of human diversity. Where a child of color is spared the toxic affects of racist attacks. Where young gay men are not beaten and left to die strapped to fence posts. Where African-

American men are not dragged to horrible deaths behind pick-up trucks. Where the images of September 11 are replaced with the actions of an international community committed to justice for all and intolerant of hate and violence.

We need a vision of society where the power of the Internet reduces the isolation of senior citizens and opens up a world of possibilities to all children; a society where pornographic Internet sites and hate groups wither in the light of those possibilities. A new generation of faculty, apprenticed under a new model for doctoral education, can be committed to research and teaching that contributes to the goal of a civil, equitable, and humane society. The billions of dollars this country invests in higher education every year and the hundreds of thousands of students and faculty in the higher education community can be mobilized to efforts that improve public policy, elevate communities, and improve lives.

This is the vision that should feed our passion. This is the vision that should lead us to action as we move to improve doctoral education and all of higher education.

Works Cited

Golde, C.M. and T. M. Dore. 2001. *At cross-purposes: What the experiences of today's graduate students reveal about doctoral education.* Philadelphia: The Pew Charitable Trusts.

Huber, M. and S. Morreale, eds. 2002. *Disciplinary styles in the scholarship of teaching and learning.* Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation.

Massey, W.F., A. K. Wilger, and C. Colbech. 1994. Overcoming "hollowed" collegiality. *Change*, July/Aug., 10-20.

Putnam, Robert D. 2001. *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Stokes, D. 1999. *Pasteur's quadrant: Basic science and technologlical innovations.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

AAC&U Statement on Liberal Learning

A truly liberal education is one that prepares us to live responsible, productive, and creative lives in a dramatically changing world. It is an education that fosters a well-grounded intellectual resilience, a disposition toward lifelong learning, and an acceptance of responsibility for the ethical consequences of our ideas and actions. Liberal education requires that we understand the foundations of knowledge and inquiry about nature, culture and society; that we master core skills of perception, analysis, and expression; that we cultivate a respect for truth; that we recognize the importance of historical and cultural context; and that we explore connections among formal learning, citizenship, and service to our communities.

We experience the benefits of liberal learning by pursuing intellectual work that is honest, challenging, and significant, and by preparing ourselves to use knowledge and power in responsible ways. Liberal learning is not confined to particular fields of study. What matters in liberal education is substantial content, rigorous methodology and an active engagement with the societal, ethical, and practical implications of our learning. The spirit and value of liberal learning are equally relevant to all forms of higher education and to all students.

Because liberal learning aims to free us from the constraints of ignorance, sectarianism, and myopia, it prizes curiosity and seeks to expand the boundaries of human knowledge. By its nature, therefore, liberal learning is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives.

The ability to think, to learn, and to express oneself both rigorously and creatively, the capacity to understand ideas and issues in context, the commitment to live in society, and the yearning for truth are fundamental features of our humanity. In centering education upon these qualities, liberal learning is society's best investment in our shared future.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges & Universities, October 1998.

AAC&U encourages distribution, so long as attribution is given.

Please address general inquiries to info@aacu.nw.dc.us.

AAC&U is the leading national association devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal learning for all students, regardless of academic specialization or intended career. Since its founding in 1915, AAC&U's membership has grown to more than 740 accredited public and private colleges and universities of every type and size.

AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning. Its mission is to reinforce the collective commitment to liberal education at both the national and local levels and to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work as they evolve to meet new economic and social challenges.

For additional information about AAC&U programs and publications, visit www.aacu-edu.org.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Council of Graduate Schools is dedicated to the improvement and advancement of graduate education. Its members are colleges and universities engaged in research, scholarship, and the preparation of candidates for advanced degrees.

Association of American Colleges and Universities

The Association of American Colleges & Universities is devoted to advancing and strengthening liberal learning for all students. AAC&U functions as a catalyst and facilitator, forging links among presidents, administrators, and faculty members who are engaged in institutional and curricular planning to reinforce a collective commitment to liberal education to help individual institutions keep the quality of student learning at the core of their work.

Preparing Future Faculty

PFF Staff and Contact Information

Jerry Gaff, Co-Director
Senior Scholar, AAC&U
gaff@aacu.nw.dc.us

Anne Pruitt-Logan, Co-Director
Scholar in Residence, CGS
apruitt@cgs.nche.org

Preparing Future Faculty National Office
1818 R Street, N.W. • Washington, D.C. 20009-1604
(202) 387-3760 • (202) 265-9532 fax
pff@aacu.nw.dc.us

How to learn more about the PFF Program?

The PFF national office maintains a vast collection of materials from the participating campuses as well as from the higher education literature. In addition to PFF occasional papers published by AAC&U and CGS, the resources include speeches and reports, sample syllabi and seminar outlines, and much more.

The national staff also manages an electronic mailing list, PFFNET, which is available to anyone interested in the program.

Information about all these resources and papers is available on the PFF website <www.preparing-faculty.org>

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").